DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 343 991 UD 028 619

AUTHOR Chamberlain, Ed
TITLE Neglected or Delinquent Program 1990-91. Final Evaluation Report. Elementary and Secondary Education Act--Chapter 1.
INSTITUTION Columbus Public Schools, OH. Dept. of Program Evaluation.
PUB DATE Sep 91
NOTE 27p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Achievement Gains; Basic Skills; *Child Neglect; Compensatory Education; *Delinquency; *Disadvantaged Youth; *Elementary School Students; Elementary Secondary Education; *Language Arts; Minority Group Children; Outcomes of Education; Program Evaluation; Remedial Programs; *Secondary School Students; Tutorial Programs; Urban Schools
IDENTIFIERS *Columbus Public Schools OH; Education Consolidation Improvement Act Chapter 1

ABSTRACT

The Neglected or Delinquent Program (N or D) of the Columbus (Ohio) Public Schools is designed to provide classrooms and tutorial services in language development for students served in facilities eligible for Chapter 1 aid for the neglected or delinquent. In the 1990-91 school year, one full-time N or D teacher and 12 part-time tutors served 153 students in grades one through 12 (116 in grades six through 12). Sixty-nine students were non-minority, 81 were Black, one was Hispanic American, and two were Oriental. The program's desired outcome for the school year stated that at least 50 percent of students who met attendance criteria, were English-speaking, and had a pretest-posttest score for basic skills would gain at least 3.0 normal curve equivalent (NCE) points for the period September through March. Of the 153 students, 63 were exempt from testing because of eligibility for special education, and 89 were excluded from analysis because of incomplete data. The one student for whom all data (and attendance requirements) were complete made the desired gain in total reading and a gain of 4.0 NCE points in reading comprehension on an achievement test. The continuation of the program is recommended for the 1991-92 school year, and revision of the criteria for an evaluation sample is also suggested. Six tables present study findings, and an appendix contains worksheets and instruments from the evaluation process. (SLD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED343991

Elementary and Secondary Education Act - Chapter 1

FINAL EVALUATION REPORT
NEGLECTED OR DELINQUENT PROGRAM

1990-91

Written by:

Ed Chamberlain
Professional Specialist

Under the Supervision of:

E. Jane Williams, Ph.D.

Data Analysis by:

Kathy L. Morgan
Professional Specialist

Under the Supervision of:

Richard A. Amorose, Ph.D.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
G. Thompson
Columbus Public Schools
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Columbus (Ohio) Public Schools
Department of Program Evaluation
Gary Thompson, Ph.D., Director

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in the document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

U0028619

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Elementary and Secondary Education Act - Chapter 1

FINAL EVALUATION REPORT
NEGLECTED OR DELINQUENT PROGRAM
1990-91

ABSTRACT

Program Description: The Neglected or Delinquent Program (N or D) is designed to provide classroom and tutorial services in the area of language development for pupils served in Chapter 1 eligible facilities for the neglected or delinquent. During the 1990-91 school year, there was one full-time N or D reading teacher and 12 part-time tutors providing services in nine institutions. In terms of full-time equivalency, the program was served by 4.43 teachers.

Time Interval: For purposes of evaluating achievement test data, data were collected for the period from September 17, 1990, through March 28, 1991. This interval of time provided 116 possible days for instruction. Additional Enrollment/Attendance data were collected through May 3, 1991, an additional twenty possible days.

Desired Outcome: The program's Desired Outcome stated that at least 50% of the pupils in the sample--those who met the attendance criterion, were English speaking, and had a pretest-posttest score for Total Reading (basic skills)--would gain at least 3.0 Normal Curve Equivalent (NCE) points for the instructional period. In addition, aggregate scores were obtained for both Total Reading (Basic Skills) and Reading Comprehension (Advanced Skills) scores.

Evaluation Design: The Desired Outcome and additional analysis were evaluated through the pretest-posttest administration of the Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills (CTBS, 1981) for grades 2-12. Pretest data were not available for grade 1.

Major Findings: The program served a total of 153 pupils for an average of 2.5 hours of instruction per week. Of the pupils served, 37 were in grades 1 through 5, and 116 were in grades 6 through 12. The average daily membership was 52.5. The average days of enrollment per pupil was 33.8, and the average days of attendance per pupil was 26.3. There was a high degree of pupil mobility due to varying lengths of time pupils were assigned to the institutional facilities served.

Of the 153 pupils served in the program, 50 were girls and 103 were boys. In regard to ethnic origin, 69 pupils were non-minority, 81 were Black, one was Hispanic and two were Oriental. The percent of minority pupils served was 54.9%.

Of the 153 pupils served in the program, 63 were exempted from testing due to their eligibility for Special Education, and 89 pupils were excluded from achievement test analysis due to incomplete test data and/or non-attainment of the attendance criterion. The final evaluation sample consisted of one eleventh grade pupil who made a gain of 3.0 NCE points in Total Reading (basic skills) and a gain of 4.0 NCE points in Reading Comprehension (advanced skills).

Recommendations: It is recommended that the N or D Program be continued in the 1991-92 school year. The program provides a needed service to pupils in exceptional circumstances. It is further recommended that criteria for the evaluation of the program be re-examined in light of the high incidence of program pupils eligible for Special Education and the limited number of days most pupils were enrolled in the program. The extremely small size of the 1990-91 evaluation sample may indicate a need for alternatives to the achievement testing model for evaluation of this program.

Elementary and Secondary Education Act - Chapter 1

FINAL EVALUATION REPORT
NEGLECTED OR DELINQUENT PROGRAM

September 1991

Program Description

The Neglected or Delinquent Program (N or D) is designed to provide classroom and tutorial services in the area of language development for pupils served in Chapter 1 eligible facilities for the neglected or delinquent. The N or D Component became a separate entity under ESEA Title I in the 1968-69 school year, at which time emphasis was placed on providing intensive service to pupils residing in institutions.

During the 1990-91 school year, there were one full time N or D reading teacher and 12 teachers providing tutorial services on a part-time basis to pupils in nine institutions. In terms of full-time equivalency, the program was served by 4.43 teachers. The term "teachers" will be used in this report to designate providers of instruction, whether in a small group or a tutorial setting. The institutions in which services occurred were: Rosemont School, Family Times Group Home, Hampton Group Home, Hannah Neil Center, Joyce Avenue Group Home, Karl Road Group Home, Neil Avenue Group Home, Whittier Group Home, and Youth Advocate Services.

Evaluation Design

Desired Outcome

The program's Desired Outcome was as follows:

> At least 50 percent of the pupils in the evaluation sample (those pupils who have a valid pretest and posttest measure and attend the program at least 80 percent of the instructional period) will gain at least 3.0 normal curve equivalent (NCE) points for the instructional period in total reading. Gain will be measured by a nationally standardized achievement test.

In addition to data related to total reading as specified in the Desired Outcome, data were also collected on reading comprehension. This was done since federal guidelines require that aggregate test data be reported for grades 2 and above for both Total Reading and Reading Comprehension for individual buildings. For purposes of evaluating achievement test data, the instructional period was considered to be the period from September 17, 1990, through March 28, 1991. This interval of time provided 116 possible days for instruction. Additional enrollment/attendance data were collected through May 3, 1991, an additional 20 possible days.

Instruments

Data were collected in three areas. Copies of the instruments used to collect data are found in the Appendix, with the exception of the standardized achievement tests.

1. Pupil Census Instruments

Calendar Worksheet for Recording Days of Pupil Service. The Calendar Worksheet was used to help program teachers collect program service data. A Calendar Worksheet was kept for each pupil. The form included the following information: the pupil's name, birthdate, student number, ethnic or race code, sex, grade, and hours of instruction scheduled per week. Days of instruction scheduled and served were recorded by program teachers so that correct information was available to report at the end of the year on the Pupil Data Sheet. Copies of the Calendar Worksheets were collected at regular intervals in order to maintain a master file of Chapter 1 pupils served in facilities other than those provided by the school system. A copy of the Calendar Worksheet is found in the Appendix, page 13.

Pupil Data Sheet. The Pupil Data Sheet was developed to help program teachers summarize the pupil information from the Calendar Worksheet. This instrument was used to collect the following information: data identifying those pupils who were non-English speaking, subjective ratings of pupil progress given by teachers, the number of hours of instruction per week, number of days scheduled for instruction, and number of days service received. Days scheduled and days of instruction were specified for the period from September 17, 1990 through March 28, 1991 (used for the attendance criterion for the Desired Outcome) and for the period from April 8 through May 3, 1991 (days after the spring break date which were included in the overall enrollment/attendance data). A copy of the Pupil Data Sheet is found in the Appendix, page 14.

2. Standardized Achievement Test Instruments

Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills (CTBS, 1981). The Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills (CTBS, 1981) was administered to program pupils in grades 2-12. This test series, which is published by CTB/McGraw-Hill, has empirical norms for fall and spring, established October 6-10, 1980, and April 27 to May 1, 1981. A spring-to-spring testing cycle was used for grades 2-12.

Metropolitan Achievement Tests Sixth Edition (MAT6, 1985). The Metropolitan Achievement Tests, Sixth Edition (MAT6, 1985) was the test designated for first grade. Standardization was established between October 1 and 31 in 1984 for fall, and spring standardization was established between April 8 and May 15 in 1985. Pretest data were not available for grade 1.

All testing was done on level using the Norm-Referenced Model for evaluation for Chapter 1 programs. A spring-to-spring cycle was used for grades 2-12.

Many pupils served in institutions for the neglected and delinquent also attended schools in the Columbus Public Schools. Where this was the case pupils in grades 1-10 were tested in their regular classrooms as part of Districtwide Testing. Pupils in grades 11 and 12, and pupils not attending a Columbus Public School, were tested by their program teachers. The form, subtest, and test levels used for each grade level are shown in Table 1.

Table 1

Table of Standardized Achievement Measures for
Chapter 1 Neglected or Delinquent Program
1990-91

Grade	Pretest				Posttest			
	Test	Level	Form	Subtest(s)	Test	Level	Form	Subtest(s)
	Spring 1990				Spring 1991			
1					MAT6	PR	L	Total Reading[b] (3 subtests)
2	MAT6	PR	L	Total Reading	MAT6	P1	L	Total Reading[b]
					CTBS	D	V	Total Reading[c]
3	CTBS	D	V	Total Reading[c]	CTBS	E	V	Total Reading
4	CTBS	E	V	Total Reading	CTBS	F	V	Total Reading
5	CTBS	F	V	Total Reading	CTBS	G	V	Total Reading
6	CTBS	G	V	Total Reading	CTBS	G	V	Total Reading
7	CTBS	G	V	Total Reading	CTBS	H	V	Total Reading
8	CTBS	H	V	Total Reading[d]	CTBS	H	V	Total Reading
9	CTBS	H	V	Total Reading	CTBS	J	V	Total Reading
10	CTBS	J	V	Total Reading	CTBS	J	V	Total Reading
11	CTBS	J	V	Total Reading	CTBS	J	V	Total Reading
12	CTBS	J	V	Total Reading	CTBS	J	V	Total Reading

Note. The CTBS Total Reading scores include the Vocabulary and Reading Comprehension subtests.

[a] The Reading Test measures Visual Discrimination, Letter Recognition, and Auditory Discrimination.

[b] Total Reading includes the Vocabulary, Word Recognition, and Reading Comprehension subtests.

[c] The CTBS Level D, Form V was administered to grade 2 pupils as part of the Districtwide Testing activity. This test will serve as a pretest for the 1991-92 school year for pupils who are promoted to grade 3.

[d] The CTBS grade 8 pretest was administered in Spring 1990 when pupils were in grade 7. It was a customized test that provided norm-referenced as well as criterion-referenced scores. The total reading score was estimated by the administration of Customized Form V. The customized tests were developed by Columbus Public Schools personnel in cooperation with CTB/McGraw Hill to match the Columbus Public Schools Graded Course of Study.

3. Inservice Evaluation Instrument

Orientation Inservice Evaluation Form. This locally developed instrument was designed to obtain teacher perceptions regarding the Orientation inservice session, which was held October 16, 1990. An abbreviated version of the instrument, the General Inservice Evaluation Form, was used at a Chapter 1 inservice meeting on the Writing Process and Computer Take-home Program, which was held March 22, 1991, and was attended by two of the N or D teachers. The two instruments used for inservice evaluation are found in the Appendix, pages 15-17.

Major Findings

Pupil Census Information

A total of 153 pupils in institutions was served by the ESEA Chapter 1 N or D Program during the 1990-91 school year for an average of 2.5 hours of instruction per week. Of the pupils served, 37 were in grades 1 through 5, and 116 were in grades 6 through 12. The average daily membership in the program was 52.5. The average days of enrollment per pupil was 33.8, and the average days of attendance per pupil was 26.3. Data pertaining to enrollment and attendance are presented in Table 2.

Of the 153 pupils served in the program, 50 were girls and 103 were boys. In regard to ethnic origin, 69 pupils were non-minority, 81 were Black, one was Hispanic, and two were Oriental. The percent of minority pupils served was 54.9%. Table 3 contains data on ethnic origin of pupils served.

Pupils were served by one full-time N or D reading teacher and 12 tutors working on a part-time basis in nine institutions. Both full-time and tutorial instructors are referred to as teachers in this report. An additional 118 pupils at Rosemont School and Rosemont Receiving Center received diagnostic testing from the N or D reading teacher between September 1990 and January 1991, but were not enrolled in the program. The average number of pupils served by each of the 13 teachers during the school year was 11.8, with the average number of pupils per teacher at any given time being 4.0 based on average daily membership. The pupil-teacher ratio based on average daily membership divided by teacher full-time equivalency was 11.8. There was a high degree of pupil mobility due to the varying lengths of time pupils were assigned to the institutional facilities served.

Pupil census information also included teacher subjective ratings of pupil progress as pupils exited the program. Of the 153 pupils served in the program 48 (31.4%) were rated by their program teachers as making much progress, 71 (46.4%) as making some progress, and 34 (22.2%) as making no progress. For progress ratings by grade see Table 4.

Standardized Achievement Test Information

Standardized Achievement test data were of two types. Total Reading scores were used to assess the program's Desired Outcome: that at least 50 percent of the pupils in the evaluation sample gain at least 3.0 NCE points for the instructional period. In addition, aggregate scores were obtained for both Total Reading and Reading Comprehension. Federal guidelines require that aggregate test data be reported for grade 2 and above for both Total Reading (Basic Skills) and Reading Comprehension (Advanced Skills) for individual buildings.

Table 2

Number of Pupils Served and Averages for Days of Enrollment, Days of Attendance, Daily Membership and Hours of Instruction Per Week Reported by Grade Level for N or D Program 1990-91

Grade	Pupils Served			Average			
	N	Girls	Boys	Days of Enrollment	Days of Attendance	Daily Membership	Hours of Instruction per Pupil per Week
1	3	0	3	25.0	24.0	1.2	1.3
2	5	1	4	44.2	43.8	2.5	1.4
3	5	0	5	40.4	39.8	2.0	1.7
4	13	2	11	40.2	39.7	5.0	1.8
5	11	1	10	58.1	53.4	6.2	2.0
6	8	1	7	34.6	33.1	2.7	2.4
7	17	3	14	34.8	19.6	5.1	2.1
8	23	8	15	37.3	23.2	7.6	2.4
9	37	17	20	19.7	15.2	8.5	2.8
10	18	11	7	35.8	22.3	6.2	3.1
11	10	4	6	26.2	20.5	4.3	3.2
12	3	2	1	51.0	43.0	1.3	3.5
Total	153	50	103	33.8	26.3	52.5	2.5

Table 3
Number of Pupils Served by Ethnic Origin and
Percent of Minority Pupils Reported by
Grade Level for N or D Program
1990-91

Grade	Pupils Served	Non-Minority	Black	Spanish	Oriental	American Indian	Percent Minority Pupils
1	3	1	2	0	0	0	66.7
2	5	2	3	0	0	0	60.0
3	5	0	5	0	0	0	100.0
4	13	6	7	0	0	0	53.8
5	11	5	6	0	0	0	54.5
6	8	4	4	0	0	0	50.0
7	17	5	11	0	1	0	70.6
8	23	16	6	1	0	0	30.4
9	37	19	17	0	1	0	48.6
10	18	7	11	0	0	0	61.1
11	10	3	7	0	0	0	70.0
12	3	1	2	0	0	0	66.7
Total	153	69	81	1	2	0	54.9

Table 4

Progress of N or D Program Pupils as Rated
by Program Teachers
1990-91

Grade	Pupils Served	Descriptors of Amount of Progress					
		Much		Some		None	
	N	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	3	1	33.3	1	33.3	1	33.3
2	5	3	60.0	2	40.0	0	0.0
3	5	3	60.0	2	40.0	0	0.0
4	13	6	46.2	7	53.8	0	0.0
5	11	6	54.5	5	45.5	0	0.0
6	8	5	62.5	2	25.0	1	12.5
7	17	4	23.5	7	41.2	6	35.3
8	23	7	30.4	10	43.5	6	26.1
9	37	8	21.6	17	45.9	12	32.4
10	18	1	5.6	10	55.6	7	38.9
11	10	3	30.0	6	60.0	1	10.0
12	3	1	33.3	2	66.7	0	0.0
Total	153	48	31.4	71	46.4	34	22.2

In order to be in the evaluation sample pupils had to be English speaking, meet the attendance criterion (80% of the days scheduled for instruction) and have both a pretest and a posttest score. In addition, pupils who were eligible for Special Education were exempted from testing since their test scores would not be considered valid.

Of the 153 pupils served in the program, all were English speaking. Sixty-three pupils were excluded from the sample due to their eligibility for Special Education. An additional 89 pupils were excluded from analysis due to incomplete test data and/or non-attainment of the attendance criterion. The final evaluation sample consisted of one eleventh grade pupil, or 0.7% of the pupils served. This one pupil made a gain of 3.0 NCE points in Total Reading (Basic Skills), thus attaining the performance criterion for the Desired Outcome. In addition the pupil gained 4.0 NCE points in Reading Comprehension (Advanced Skills). Needless to say, achievement test results should be interpreted with caution due to the small sample size. Achievement test results are presented in Table 5.

Inservice Evaluation Information

The Orientation Inservice Evaluation Form was completed by the 13 program teachers who attended the orientation meeting in October, 1990. In addition two program teachers attended a Chapter 1 inservice meeting on the Writing Process and Computer Take-home Program in March, 1991. The latter inservice meeting was evaluated using the General Inservice Evaluation Form. Both versions of the instrument are found in the Appendix, p. 15-17. Participants were asked after each session to rate four statements about the inservice on a scale of (1) to (5):

5 = Strongly Agree
4 = Agree
3 = Undecided
2 = Disagree
1 = Strongly Disagree

Open-ended questions on the inservice evaluation forms asked participants to comment on the most valuable parts of meetings, on the least valuable parts of meetings, and on information they would like to have covered in future meetings.

Reports on individual meetings were forwarded to Federal and State Programs and are available on request. Generally, ratings by inservice participants tended to be somewhat positive. Overall ratings by participants are summarized in Table 6.

Table 5

Summary of Norm-Referenced Test Results for the Evaluation
Sample of the Neglected and Delinquent Program
1990-91

Grade	N	NCE Scores						Percentile Scores			
		Total Reading			Reading Comprehension			Total Reading		Reading Comprehension	
		Pretest	Posttest	Change	Pretest	Posttest	Change	Pretest	Posttest	Pretest	Posttest
11	1	46.0	49.0	3.0	45.0	49.0	4.0	43.0	49.0	40.0	49.0

Table 6

Number Responding, Average Response, and Percent of Response on Rating Scale Items on the Inservice Evaluation Form for Teachers in the Chapter 1 Neglected and Delinquent Program 1990-91

Items	Number Responding	Average Response	Percent				
			Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Undecided (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)
1. I think this was a very worthwhile meeting.	15	3.7	26.7	33.3	26.7	13.3	0.0
2. The information presented in the meeting will assist me in my program.	15	3.5	13.3	46.7	20.0	13.3	6.7
3. There was time to ask questions pertaining to the presentation.	15	4.3	26.7	73.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
4. Questions were answered adequately.	15	3.8	26.7	46.7	13.3	6.7	6.7

Summary/Recommendations

The program provided instructional services to 153 pupils served by 13 teachers in nine institutions for the neglected or delinquent. The average daily membership was 52.5. There was considerable turnover in pupil enrollment during the year, as is normal in N or D facilities. The average days of enrollment per pupil was 33.8 days, and the average days of attendance was 26.3.

The Desired Outcome of the program stated that at least 50 percent of the pupils in the evaluation sample (those pupils who had a valid pretest and posttest measure, attended the program at least 80 percent of the instructional period, and were English speaking) would gain at least 3.0 normal curve equivalent (NCE) points for the instructional period in Total Reading, as measured by a nationally standardized achievement test.

Sixty-three (41.2%) of the 153 pupils tested were exempted from testing due to their eligibility for Special Education. An additional 89 pupils (58.2% of the pupils served) were excluded from the evaluation sample due to incomplete test data and/or non-attainment of the attendance criterion. The evaluation sample consisted of the one remaining pupil, an eleventh grade pupil.

The one pupil in the evaluation sample made a gain of 3.0 NCE points in Total Reading and attained the performance criterion for the Desired Outcome. In further analysis, the pupil's Reading Comprehension score showed a gain of 4.0 NCE points.

One inservice meeting was attended by all 13 N or D teachers and a second meeting included two N or D teachers. In general, program teachers gave slightly positive ratings to the inservice meetings.

It is recommended that the N or D Program be continued next year. The program provides a needed service to pupils in exceptional circumstances. It is further recommended that criteria for the evaluation of the program be re-examined in light of the high incidence of program pupils eligible for Special Education and the limited number of days most pupils were enrolled in the program. The extremely small size of the 1990-91 evaluation sample may indicate a need for alternatives to the achievement testing model for evaluation of this program.

Appendix

NEGLECTED OR DELINQUENT (N or D) PROGRAM
* CALENDAR WORKSHEET FOR RECORDING DAYS OF PUPIL SERVICE *
1990-91

Student's Name _____

Student's Birthdate _ _ _ _ _ _
M M D D Y Y

Student Number _ _ _ _ _ _

Race Code _____ (1-5) Sex _____ (M or F)

Note: Please keep original worksheets for all pupils (even for pupils who leave). Do not send to program coordinator or to other schools.

Grade Level _ _

Hours Scheduled Per Week _____

Teacher Name _____

Program Code 9 1 0 6 0

N or D Facility _____

Public School Attended _____

Public School Code _ _ _

Office Use Only: ____

1990-91	M	T	W	TH	F	M	T	W	TH	F	M	T	W	TH	F	M	T	W	TH	F
Aug. 27 - Sept. 21	M	M	29	30	31	H	4	5	6	7	10	11	12	13	14	17	18	19	20	21
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0					
Sept. 24 - Oct. 19	24	25	26	27	28	1	2	3	4	5	8	9	10	11	12	15	16	17	18	COTA
																				0
Oct. 22 - Nov. 16	22	23	24	25	26	29	30	31	1	2	5	6	7	8	9	12	13	14	15	PC
																				0
Nov. 19 - Dec. 14	19	20	21	H	N	26	27	28	29	30	3	4	5	6	7	10	11	12	13	14
				0	0															
Dec. 17 - Jan. 18	17	18	19	N	N	N	N	N	3	4	7	8	9	10	11	14	15	16	17	18
				0	0	0	0	0												
Jan. 21 - Feb. 15	H	22	23	24	25	28	29	30	31	1	4	5	6	7	8	11	12	13	14	PC
	0																			0
Feb. 18 - Mar. 15	18	19	20	21	22	25	26	27	28	1	4	5	6	7	8	11	12	13	14	15
Mar. 18 - Apr. 12	18	19	20	21	22	25	26	27	28	N	N	N	N	N	N	8	9	10	11	12
										0	0	0	0	0	0					
Apr. 15 - May 10	15	16	17	18	19	22	23	24	25	26	29	30	1	2	3	6	7	8	9	10
																0	0	0	0	0
May 13 - June 7	13	14	15	16	17	20	21	22	23	24	H	28	29	30	31	3	4	5	6	R
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

OFFICIAL FIRST DAY OF ENROLLMENT FOR SPECIFIC PROGRAMS:

Consulting Teacher Programs Sept. 17th
Early Literacy 2 Sept. 17th
Non-Public 2-8 Sept. 17th
N or D 2-12 Sept. 17th
Early Literacy 1 Sept. 24th
Non-Public 1 Sept. 24th
N or D 1 Sept. 24th
Instructional Assistant 1 Sept. 24th
Instructional Assistant K Oct. 1st
All Day Kindergarten Oct. 1st
Full Day Kindergarten

RACE CODES
1 = Non-Minority
2 = Black
3 = Spanish Surname
4 = Asian American
5 = American Indian

SERVICE CODES
0 = Pupil Not Scheduled (Inservice, Teacher Illness, Personal Day, Snow Day, Parent Conference Day, etc.)
1 = Pupil Scheduled and Not Served (Absent from School/Class)
2 = Pupil Served (Pupil Present)

22

EVALSRVCS/P505/RPTFND91

23

13

COLUMBUS PUBLIC SCHOOLS COMPENSATORY EDUCATION 14
PUPIL DATA SHEET

SCHOOL CODE |_|_|_|_| PROGRAM CODE |_|_|_|_|_|_| SSN |_|_|_|_|_|_|_|_|_|

School Name _____ Program Name _____ Teacher Name _____

1. |_|_|_|_|_|_|_|_|_|_|_|_|_|_|_| |_|_|_|_|_|_|_|_|_|_|_|_|_| |_|

Student: Last Name First Name M.I.

2. STUDENT NO. |_|_|_|_|_|_|_| GRADE |_|_| BIRTHDATE |_|_|_|_|_|_|_|_|

m m d d y y

3. Is This Pupil English Speaking? NO YES

4. Pupil Progress: NONE SOME MUCH

5. Hours Per Week of Instruction |_|_|_|.|_|

6. Pupil Was Discontinued NO YES 92001, 92002, 92007, 92060, 92104

7. Parent Helped With Homework NO YES 92007, 92017, 92060

8. Parent Reads to Child or Child Reads to Parent NO YES 92007, 92017, 92060

FOR QUESTIONS 6-8, CIRCLE NO, YES, OR YOUR PROGRAM CODE IF IT IS LISTED. (SEE PROGRAM CODE ON PREPRINTED FORMS.)

For numbers 9-13, fill in the number of parents involved in each activity during the year and cumulative hours of contact.

		No. of Parents	No. of Hours
9.	Planning	|_|_|	|_|_|_|_|.|_|_|
10.	Group Meetings	|_|_|	|_|_|_|_|.|_|_|
11.	Individual Conferences	|_|_|	|_|_|_|_|.|_|_|
12.	Classroom Visits	|_|_|	|_|_|_|_|.|_|_|
13.	Home Visits	|_|_|	|_|_|_|_|.|_|_|

		thru 04-03-92	from 04-06-92 thru 05-01-92
14.	Number of Days Service Scheduled (Carefully Read Instructions)	|_|_|_|_|	|_|_|_|_|
15.	Number of Days Service Received (Carefully Read Instructions)	|_|_|_|_|	|_|_|_|_|

ESEA CHAPTER 1, CHAPTER 2, AND DPPF
ORIENTATION INSERVICE EVALUATION FORM
1990-91 ORIENTATION

Date of Orientation Meeting _____ A.M.___ P.M.___

Circle only the program(s) you are in:

ESEA Chapter 2 Program:
(1) FDK

ESEA Chapter 1 Programs:
(2) ADK
(3) Reading-Elementary (2-5)
(4) Mathematics-Elementary (3-5)
(5) Reading-Middle School (6-8)
(6) Mathematics-Middle School (6-8)
(7) N or D (1-12)
(8) Non-Public (1-8)
(9) Reading Recovery (1)
(10) Chap. 1 Early Literacy (1-2)

DPPF Programs:
(11) Instructional Assistant - K
(12) Instructional Assistant - 1
(13) DPPF HSCA
(14) DPPF Early Literacy (2)

General Fund Program:
(15) General Fund HSCA

Other (Specify)
(16) _____

Circle the number that indicates the extent to which you agree with statements 1-4, in rating the overall day of inservice.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. I think this was a very worthwhile inservice.	5	4	3	2	1
2. The information presented in this inservice will assist me in my program.	5	4	3	2	1
3. There was time to ask questions pertaining to the presentations.	5	4	3	2	1
4. Questions were answered adequately.	5	4	3	2	1

Circle the number that indicates how you would rate each of the following portions of today's inservice in regard to interest and usefulness of presentations.

	Superior	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
5. Program Coordinators' Presentation					
a. Interest	5	4	3	2	1
b. Usefulness	5	4	3	2	1
c. Clarity of instructions	5	4	3	2	1

****
*
* Please turn over for questions 6-9 *
*
****

	Superior	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
6. Evaluation Presentation					
a. Interest	5	4	3	2	1
b. Usefulness	5	4	3	2	1
c. Clarity of instructions	5	4	3	2	1

7. What was the most valuable part of this meeting?_____

_____

8. What was the least valuable part of this meeting?_____

_____

9. What additional information or topics would you like to see covered in future meetings?

_____

_____

_____

GENERAL INSERVICE EVALUATION FORM
1990-91

Inservice Topic: _____

Presenter(s): _____

Date: ____/____/____ (e.g., 03/05/91)
MM DD YY

Session (Check only one): _____ all day _____a.m. _____ p.m. _____ after school

Circle only the program(s) you are in:

ESEA Chapter 2 Program:
(1) FDK

ESEA Chapter 1 Programs:
(2) ADK
(3) Reading-Elementary (2-5)
(4) Mathematics-Elementary (3-5)
(5) Reading-Middle School (6-8)
(6) Mathematics-Middle School (6-8)
(7) N or D (1-12)
(8) Non-Public (1-8)
(9) Reading Recovery (1)
(10) Chap. 1 Early Literacy (1-2)

DPPF Programs:
(11) Instructional Assistant - K
(12) Instructional Assistant - 1
(13) DPPF HSCA
(14) DPPF Early Literacy (2)

General Fund Programs:
(15) General Fund HSCA
(16) Early Literacy (GF)
(17) Reading-Elementary (GF)
(18) Mathematics-Elementary (GF)
(19) Reading-Middle School (GF)

Other (Specify)
(20) _____

Circle the number that indicates the extent to which you agree or disagree with statements 1-4.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. I think this was a very worthwhile meeting.	5	4	3	2	1
2. The information presented in this meeting will assist me in my program.	5	4	3	2	1
3. There was time to ask questions pertaining to the presentation.	5	4	3	2	1
4. Questions were answered adequately.	5	4	3	2	1

5. What was the most valuable part of this meeting? _____

_____

6. What was the least valuable part of this meeting? _____

_____

7. Please list any additional information or topics you would like to see covered in future meetings. a) _____

b) _____

c) _____